



special
collections
DOUGLAS
LIBRARY



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

S

t

L

Q

A

Ki

THE
PROGRESS
OF
THE REVOLUTIONS
OF
1640 AND 1830.

LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.
1832.

AC 911. 1832 P76

LONDON:
Printed by A. & R. Spottiswoode,
New-Street-Square.

PROGRESS
OF
THE REVOLUTIONS
OF 1640 AND 1830.

“THOUGH for no other cause, yet for this, — that
“posterity may know we have not loosely, through
“silence, permitted things to pass away as in a
“dream, there shall be, for men’s information,
“extant thus much concerning the present state
“of things established among us, and their care-
“ful endeavours, which would have upheld the
“same.”¹

History is Philosophy teaching by examples;
and if her lessons be read in a pure and docile
mind, they cannot fail to set before us truths in-
controvertible, however much carped at: by re-
vealing the causes of former evil, she developes the

¹ Hooker’s Eccl. Pol.

results of existing principles ; and, by showing that Providence has not left us without a guide, justifies the dealings of God towards man.

Tacitus, in his first book¹, has an awful sentiment, — “ *Nec enim unquam atrocioribus populi*
“ Romani cladibus, magisque justis indiciis approba-
“ tum est, non esse curæ deis securitatem nostram,
“ esse ultionem.” Overwhelming, if true ! But had the Roman nation deeply considered the crimes and errors of their forefathers, regulating thereby the whole course of government, they would have obtained the security, and escaped the vengeance. Even so is it with us. The former scourging of our native land, still terrible, though long passed, — the unprecedented horrors which lacerated France, and astonished mankind, — are volumes superabundant in wisdom. “ Wisdom crieth without ; she uttereth
 “ her voice in the streets ; . . . saying, How long, ye
 “ simple ones, will ye love simplicity ? . . . But ye
 “ have set at nought all my counsel, and would
 “ none of my reproof : I also will laugh at your
 “ calamity ; I will mock when your fear cometh ;
 “ when your fear cometh as desolation, and your
 “ destruction cometh as a whirlwind. . . . Then shall
 “ they call upon me, but I will not answer.”²

In this passage, the wisest of mortal beings most plainly sets forth two kinds of experience, — the experience of our progenitors, and the experience of ourselves. If we draw from the storehouse of former events, the experience of our ancestors may

¹ Hist. lib. i.

² Prov. i. 20—28.

lead us to safety ; but the experience of ourselves comes too late for reparation. It is the lot of all human affairs, that evils are swifter than remedies in their effects ; but more especially is it so in the action of the passions : for if the statesman neglect to observe them in their origin, and either to subdue or divert their nascent force ; in the hour of need he will be interdicted the application of the remedy, if he be not even found altogether ignorant of its nature.

In this frame of mind, we were led to enquire, what signs the history of antecedent periods had recorded for our guidance. It was our purpose to examine the prevailing passions of the past and present times ; to trace the operation of similar principles from the rise to the consummation of them ; to mark similar institutions similarly assailed ; and thus, if not too late, either point the road to safety, or at least prepare the heart for a similar desolation.

From the commencement nearly of the reign of the unfortunate Charles I. to the outbreak of civil war in 1642, may be traced the growth and exercise of principles and passions most lamentably correspondent with our own ; — the same objects to be obtained, the same language, method, and even succession of detail. Were the names but changed, and the dates expunged, any one might believe that he was reading the events of the current week¹, and

¹ It is a curious coincidence that, at both periods, a pestilence should have been raging ; the Plague then, the Cholera now.

passing, in his ordinary course of perusal, from the reported debates to the leading article of *The Times*.

Let it not be replied, that minuteness of detail is unsuited to the matter in hand : for the successive parts that constitute an event are oftentimes small and unimportant ; and, if severally taken, without reference to those which precede or follow, may, each, appear to be wholly disconnected. Our own experience, moreover, must be made up of observations on the daily progress of affairs. But, if we trace in history a path like the one now trodden before our eyes, — trodden, it is true, by different feet, but to the same measure, — we may be enabled to ascertain both whither it leads, and the objects of those who rush along its surface.

Besides, who knows not what mighty things have had their origin in small beginnings ? Signs that escape the ordinary notice of mankind, might, if understood, develope futurity ; they are the little cloud, like a man's hand arising from the sea, but in it the prophet heard “ the sound of abundance of rain.” “ Go up,” said he, “ prepare thy chariot, and get thee down, that the rain stop thee not. And it came to pass, in the mean while, that the heaven was black with clouds and wind, and there was a great rain.” The most violent disorders are oftentimes announced by slight indications : a small¹ discoloured spot declared the infection of the pestilence ; and while the malady

¹ Defoe's Hist.

was urging its dreadful ravages, the sufferer remained unobservant of the diminutive symptom.

If there were space and leisure, we might devote some pages to the earlier periods of Charles's reign; and trace, even beneath the legitimate efforts of patriots, the extreme spirit of a secret but resolute faction. This ultra party had not then acquired sufficient strength for open display; its workings may, however, be descried, and pursued in their cautious and crafty march, until they surprised the State, under the flag of the Constitution.

When plans had been at last matured, and the principles of a few unfortunately grown up into the opinions of many⁵, the Parliament of 1640 afforded them opportunity and means of advancement. So is it with us: the Parliament of 1830 gave the first House of Commons returned on the basis of reform, — both were of short duration, and speedily dissolved. In both cases, very few months had elapsed from the meeting of either Parliament

¹ “ They had divided themselves under episcopal, presbyterian, and independent professors; although this last number of men were then scarce a number, yet of all three there were; and these last were in this nation in no sort thought considerable, until the Egyptian slime and dog-star heat, in the Parliament of 1640, bred so many congregational insects, that they as laudably made Presbytery appear to them anti-Christian, as Episcopacy had appeared so unto the Presbyterians.” — *Warwick's Memoirs*.

And yet these insects ultimately attained the supreme power of the country! We have, in the Owenites, a handful of seed of the same quality, which may, like the Independents, spring up into an abundant harvest.

to the meeting of its successor. Both these latter were summoned in moments of high indignation and awful excitement: the one became the Long Parliament, and we know its results; the other is the existing House, — need we hesitate to prophesy?

Those who entertain a conviction that some reform is necessary, will at once acknowledge the applicability of Clarendon's remark to the fatal dissolution of April; and, in the latter part of the sentence, the stoutest anti-reformers (among whom we rank ourselves) will entirely concur. In writing of the dissolution of the first Parliament of 1640, he says, "Men had much of the misery in view which shortly after fell out. It could never be hoped that more sober and dispassionate men would ever meet together in that place, or fewer who brought ill purposes with them; nor could any man imagine what offence they had given, which put the King upon that resolution. But it was observed, that, in the countenances of those who had opposed all that was desired by his Majesty (the reformers of the day!) there was a marvellous serenity; nor could they conceal the joy of their hearts: for they knew enough of what was to come, to conclude that the King would be shortly compelled to call another Parliament; and they were as sure that so many so unbiassed men would never be elected again."¹

¹ The Radicals of those days and the Radicals of these, having the same ends, experience the same delight. "Within

The first Parliament of 1640 fell instantly upon grievances. It had been convoked for Supply ; but the Members, disregarding that, passed to Proclamations, Ship-money, and Ecclesiastical Jurisdictions. The Session of 1830, the first of the new Parliament, was held for arrangement of the Civil List ; but the Members conceived that their chief energies would be better devoted to discuss revolutions in France and Belgium, and institute systems of reform. The opening act of November, 1830, unseated the Conservative Government, and dislodged the Duke of Wellington : the first measure of November, 1640, overthrew the administration of the King, and drove the Earl of Strafford from power.

The mention of the Duke of Wellington suggests here a circumstance (and it is this *circumstance only*) which forms a parallel passage in his career and that of the favourite Buckingham. Hume, in relating

“ an hour after the dissolution, Mr. Hyde met Mr. St. John
 “ who had naturally a great cloud in his face, and very seldom
 “ was known to smile, but then had a most cheerful aspect ;
 “ and, seeing the other melancholick, as in truth he was from
 “ his heart, asked him, ‘ What troubled him ? ’ who answered,
 “ ‘ That the same that troubled him, he believed, troubled most
 “ ‘ good men : that in such a time of confusion, so wise a Par-
 “ ‘ liament, which alone could have found remedy for it, was
 “ ‘ so unseasonably dismissed.’ The other answered, with a little
 “ warmth, ‘ That all was well ; and that it must be worse before
 “ ‘ it could be better ; and that this Parliament could never have
 “ ‘ done what was necessary to be done ;’ as indeed it would
 “ not what he and his friends thought necessary.” — *Clarendon*,
 book ii.

the temper of Felton, uses these words : — “ While
 “ private resentment was boiling in his sullen un-
 “ sociable mind, he heard the nation resound with
 “ complaints against the Duke ; and he met with
 “ the remonstrance of the Commons, in which his
 “ enemy was represented as the cause of every na-
 “ tional grievance, and as the great enemy of the
 “ public.” — “ But here,” says Sir Philip Warwick,
 “ we must stop the thread of our discourse, and
 “ relate what influence the Parliament’s intended
 “ remonstrance had on the spirit of a discontented
 “ and hypochondriac lieutenant. The assassin,
 “ being soon after taken, confessed the fact, and
 “ professed that he was led thereunto by the ill
 “ characters which the Parliament’s declarations¹
 “ had put upon that great man.” Whoever has
 read the speeches in Parliament, and the articles of
 the press, just previously to the Duke’s resignation,
 must be struck with the resemblance. Wishing
 simply to render him odious, his enemies put him
 in danger ; for it is well known that his life must
 have been hazarded during a visit to the City ; —
 so ready are democrats to excite the passions, and
 then wonder at the havoc they have made !

But these successes were not effected without the
 aid of intimidation. Open riot and secret murmur-
 ings, the work of emissaries, prevailed throughout
 the country. At both periods, the metropolis was
 disturbed ; and in both cases, the tumults just pre-
 ceded the downfall of the Ministry (in 1640, by

¹ May, in his History of the Long Parliament, says the same.

a few months, the Parliament not then sitting ; in 1830, by a few days, the Session having begun). We will give the narrative in Clarendon's own words, and leave the reader to catch the resemblance to "*black lists*," "*pension lists*," "*hustings' speeches*," "*dinner speeches*," previously to the resignation of His Grace of Wellington :—" By this means those emissaries and agents, for the confusion which was to follow, were furnished with opportunity and art to entangle all those (and God knows they were a great many !) who were transported with those vile and vulgar considerations : *cheap senseless libels* were scattered about the city, and fixed upon gates and public remarkable places, *traducing* and *vilifying* those who were in highest trust and employment. *Tumults were raised*, and *all licence* both in action and words taken ; insomuch as a rabble of mean, unknown, dissolute persons, to the number of some thousands, attempted the house of the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth¹, with open profession and protestation that they would tear him in pieces. . . . Which was so just a cause of terror, that the Archbishop, by the King's command, lodged for some days and nights in Whitehall ; which place likewise was not unthreatened in their seditious meetings and discourses." The historian proceeds : — " It was discoursed of after, in the House of Commons, by Mr. Strode, with much pleasure and content ;

¹ The Bristol mob, the palace of the Bishop, and Lord Grey's denunciation, will here be present to every mind.

“ and it was mentioned in the first draught of the
 “ first remonstrance (when the same was brought
 “ in by Mr. Pym), not without a touch of approba-
 “ tion.” Nor were the disturbances of 1830 men-
 tioned otherwise than as natural and justifiable :
 we must all recollect the speeches of the Whigs :
 “ What but this can be expected after the Duke’s
 “ declaration against reform ; the people are nobly
 “ indignant to be denied their rights ; *let the Duke*
“ retire from office, and all will be well ! ”

At both periods there pervaded the kingdom a nervous sympathy with the movements and feelings of neighbouring countries : in 1640, the Scotch had effectually resisted the Monarch in his endeavours to impose on them the obnoxious Liturgy ; in 1830, the French had overthrown the Sovereign, who had attempted to force obedience to his famous ordinances ; — then sanguine hope in the seditious, restlessness in others, and a feverishness of sentiment in all (late humiliations having abated the respect for monarchical power), set most men’s minds upon novelties and changes.

Nor was the then state of Ireland very unlike the present : agitation, discontent, and bigotry prevailed, and ferocious rapine under the guise of religion ; one year after the meeting of that excited Parliament, the dreadful Irish rebellion began ; — June, 1832, may exhibit a resemblance still more striking.

Statesmen and patriots of the usual stamp endeavour to tranquillise these public ferments ; but other men are otherwise disposed, as seeking the

general good after their own fashion. In 1830, there arose a patriot, well skilled in the analogies of natural history with political principles; and he thought to clear his prospects by raising a thunder-storm. The times had now arrived foreseen by the prophetic Butler; and England beheld, with amazement, a future Lord Chancellor under the slough of Hudibras. It is trumpery to suppose that the author had here intended a Sir Samuel Luke; for he evidently designates one fit for St. Luke's: and so we saw an eminent personage traversing the North, denouncing the boroughmongers, rousing the people, and foaming alternately in doggrels and dithyrambics. Now mark the accuracy both of circumstance and character: —

The Times.

When civil dudgeon first grew high,
And men fell out they knew not why;
When *hard words*¹, *jealousies*, and *fears*
Set folks together by the ears.

.

His Tour.

Then did Sir Knight abandon dwelling,
And out he rode a colonelling.²

.

His Courage.

That never bowed his stubborn knee
To any thing but chivalry;

¹ Boroughmongers, reform, radical reform, ballot, tax-eaters, pensioners, &c.

² “ The knight was not only a colonel in the Parliament army, but also scoutmaster-general. This gives us some light into his character and conduct; for he is now entering

Nor put up blow but that which laid
 Right worshipful on shoulder-blade :
 Chief of domestic knights and errant,
 Either for chartel or for warrant.

.

His Qualities.

Great on the bench, great in the saddle.

.

His quick Temper.

———— his brain

Outweigh'd his rage but half a grain.

.

His Attainments.

Besides, 'tis known, he could speak *Greek*
 As naturally as pigs squeak :
 That Latin was no more difficile,
 Than to a blackbird 'tis to whistle.

.

He was in logic a great critic,
 Profoundly skilled in analytic ;
 He could distinguish and divide
 A hair 'twixt south and south-west side ;
 On either which he would dispute,
 Confute, change hands, and still confute.

.

His Eloquence.

For rhetoric he could not ope
 His mouth, but out there flew a trope.

.

His Style.

But, when he pleas'd to shew 't, his speech
 In loftiness of sound was rich ;

“ upon his proper office, full of pretendedly pious and sanctified resolutions for *the good of his country* : his peregrinations are so consistent with his office and humour, that they “ are no longer to be called fabulous or improbable.” — *Note to Hudibras.*

A Babylonish dialect,
Which learned pedants much affect ;
It was a party-coloured dress
Of patch'd and py-balled languages ;
'Twas English cut on Greek and Latin,
Like fustian heretofore on satin.

This he as volubly could vent
As if his stock would ne'er be spent ;
And truly to support that charge,
He had supplies as vast and large ;
For he could coin and counterfeit.

And when with hasty noise he spoke 'em,
The ignorant for current took 'em.

His various Knowledge.

In mathematics he was greater
Than Tycho Brahe or Erra Pater :
For he
Could wisely tell what hour o' the day
The clock does strike, by algebra.
Besides, he was a shrewd philosopher,
That had read every text and gloss over ;

All which he understood by rote,
And, as occasion served, would quote :
No matter whether right or wrong.

His notions fitted things so well,
That which was which he could not tell ;

He knew *what's what*, and that's as high
As metaphysic wit can fly.

His Religion.

For his religion, it was fit
To match his learning and his wit :

He knew the seat of Paradise,
Could tell in what degree it lies ;

And, as he was disposed, could prove it
Below the moon, or else above it.

His Disposition.

— lies

In odd, perverse antipathies :
In falling out with that or this,
And finding somewhat still amiss :
More peevish, cross, and splenetick
Than dog distract, or monkey sick.

Thus was he gifted and accoutred, —
We mean on the inside, not the outward.¹

Thus, by the combination of the Tourist and the Press, the people of England were wonderfully transported beyond their sober natures ; nor had they time to recover from the delusion. Events succeeded each other rapidly, — the Revolution in France, the General Election, the meeting of Parliament, change of Administration, the promise, then the discussion, of Reform, the Dissolution, and the renewal of the debates ; all these engines hammered upon the iron while it was yet warm, and have nearly fashioned it to the taste of the designer. But the image is still incomplete, for the workmen would liken it to the master-artist himself ; and, though all agree as to the foot, they are hesitating between his faces of Thersites and Solon.

The two Parliaments of 1640 and 1831 form extraordinary epochs in the history of England,

¹ Sir Hudibras of the former time took an oath not to shave his beard till the Parliament had triumphed over the King : Sir Hudibras of modern days made a protest not to die till he had carried the West India Question.

and probably of mankind. The Parliament of 1640 was fully prepared, from the outset, to handle and set forth the first principles of Government; it shared, and represented, the discontent of the nation: nor were its views limited to the removal of any known specific grievances, but ranged on every side in a restlessness of innovation.

The Parliament of 1831 has exhibited equal readiness to moot first principles, to represent the querulous unsettled humour of the people, and to remedy evils that are transient and specific by measures irrevocable and universal. In both Parliaments, we may describe the leading men on the popular side as partly deceived, and partly mischievous. In that of 1640, the men who, from public or personal motives, desired the amelioration of affairs (and there was ground for it), made alliance with others whom they believed to be of like sentiments and Moderation with themselves; — it was seen by the event that the moderate party had aided the Republican, but that the Republicans would not acknowledge their obligation by stopping short with the Moderates.¹ By the dissolution of

¹ As Mr. Hollis was a staunch Reformer in those days, it may be instructive to give the results of his experience: he says, “The Members of Parliament who then engaged declared themselves to desire nothing but the settlement of the kingdom in the honour and greatness of the King, and in the happiness and safety of the people. This, I am sure, was the ultimate end of many — I may say, of the chiefest of those who at that time appeared. . . .

“Whilst these men acted in the simplicity of their hearts, there was another generation of men, which, like frozen

1831, the Government was identified with the Radicals; simply because it wanted their assistance, and hated a Tory more than a Jacobin. How peculiarly suitable to the Whigs is the remark of Clarendon on the state of parties at the dissolution of 1640: — “The Court (*i. e.* the Whigs now) “was full of faction and animosity, each man more “intending the ruin of his adversary, and satisfying his private malice, than advancing his master’s “service, or complying with his public duty, and “to that purpose directing all their endeavours “and forming all their intercourse; whilst every “man *unwisely thought him whom he found an “enemy to his enemies, a friend to all his other “affections*; or rather, by the narrowness of his “understanding, and extent of his passion, contracted all his other affections to that one of revenge.” So it is now; they fancy, because a Radical hates a Tory, he must be attached to a Whig; and our fond administration are united with the Jacobins, to mitigate, by reform, the pangs of forty years’ exclusion from power.

It remains to be seen whether the Reformers of 1831 are *abler* men than the Reformers of 1640;—

“snakes that lay in their bosoms, seemed to desire only the “same things with them; and that the same should have contented them. But it was nothing so: for they had further “designs — to destroy, and cut off not a few; to make the land “an *aceldama*; to ruin the King, and as many of the nobility “and gentry as they could; alter the Government; and have “no order in the Church, nor power in the State over them. “This was the venom they harboured, which at first they were “not warm enough to put forth!” — *Memoirs of Denzil Hollis.*

will they, when the work is done, disengage themselves from the gripe of their Radical brethren? Will Sir James Graham be too strong for Colonel Harrison; Lord John, trample upon democratic giants; or the Premier make clear to an Oliver Cromwell, that all may be well, although "*he does love Lords, and is not plain Mr. Grey again?*" We cannot think so; — let them remember the fate of the Tarpeian virgin, overpowered by gratitude for successful treachery! Murderers of our blessed Constitution, let them remember the punishment of Roman parricides; perhaps in company with a monkey and a serpent (emblems of their rule) they may be tossed into the sea, stitched together in a sack made up from the *bonnets rouges* of liberty!

If a judgment be required whether the Reformers of 1831 are *honest* men than the Reformers of 1640, we may answer, that our ancestors had private wrongs to avenge, and public grievances to redress; the Government of 1831 have none. Parties or individuals, with such a purpose, might be led into extreme measures; for the force which was intended to adjust the column may level it with the ground: but the Ministers of to-day are united with the Radicals, whose co-operation they seek, while they loathe their company, and know their tendencies. Place and power are the incentives to this; and, to enjoy a little longer the externals of office, they have resigned the seals to Unions and Agitators; and the sceptre of authority is virtually wielded by journeymen and

tinkers¹: thus it was positively in the times of our forefathers, and will be so speedily with us. — Station indeed, and character, and length of services, are no more estimated as the qualities of a Ruler; clever vice or audacious popularity will henceforward force its way into the high places of the State: and truly, then, we may say of our Country, — “the wild beasts of the islands shall cry in her desolate houses, and dragons in her pleasant palaces; and her time is near to come, and her days shall not be prolonged.”

The Parliaments of 1640 and 1831 had both been preceded by events which, in their origin and consequences, have directly influenced the moral condition of Europe: the Parliament of 1640, by the Reformation; and that of 1830, by the Revolution in France. The principles then divulged and set in activity had their first national sanction in these respective Parliaments; — we may easily account for the shorter interval in which modern principles have attained completion, by the more frequent meetings of the legislative body, the unceasing intercourse foreign and domestic, and a press as restlessly abundant as it is gossiping and revolutionary.

The Reformation in England presented to men's minds a new career of thought and action; it had

¹ “The town of Chelmsford in Essex was governed, at the beginning of the Rebellion, by a tinker, two cobblers, two tailors, and two pedlers.” — *Notes to Hudibras*. Quite a political union!

affirmed the right and commenced the practice of free enquiry and private judgment; nor had it failed to weaken the reverence for antiquity in things established, and turn aside the current of opinions from the channel in which they had flowed for centuries. Ecclesiastical government having been called in question, the transition was natural to disputes on Civil Polity: for the right of free enquiry must be universal or none; as the exercise of it, when once commenced, can be limited only by defect of matter for reason to be busied on. Throughout England, in consequence, new ideas and new feelings prevailed; the nation, in its several classes, was disposed towards change; and, though many varied as to the nature and degree, nearly all were determined to abate the prerogative.

This spirit, manifested and subdued under Elizabeth, grew up under James, and attained its manhood under Charles. Yet it was not till the second Parliament of 1640 that occasion really served for a new order of things: a hostile army had then passed the English frontier, the Treasury was exhausted, and the King almost in danger; his embarrassments were unparalleled; — left without a resource, except the generosity of the Parliament, he had to deal with men whose views differed from his own; and he proceeded to make concessions, either as a return for subsidies, or in the hope of them.

In the present age, the French Revolution had extended its influence to the whole civilised world;

and our own Country was among the first to feel and exhibit the symptoms of a contagious disorder. That extraordinary crisis was no enlargement of the human mind from a degrading thralldom, but went directly to the overthrow of Religion and Government, dissolving in its course the first principles of property and social order. History had not recorded so tremendous an earthquake in the moral world; nor have opinions and institutions ever recovered from the shock of that awful period. Since then, an unbroken succession of revolutionists have acted upon the timid, the ignorant, and the speculative: their endeavours have been marked by various fortune; but it was reserved for the year 1831 to be celebrated as the era of Jacobinical consummation.

After the Duke of Wellington's power had begun to decline, enfeebled as it was by the division of his party; the Whigs, coveting office, but conscious of weakness, resolved to strengthen themselves by the alliance of the Radicals. The Duke yielded to the attack; and the Whigs succeeded him: but having no intrinsic vigour in their services, talents, or virtue, they found that their power could only be maintained by the countenance of those who had aided them to acquire it. Neither present nor future possession could be regarded as secure during the existence of the 'Tories': they fostered, therefore, the passions of the multitude; — seeking the annihilation of their adversaries, they promised Revolution to the triumphant people; and, like

those bargainers with Satan who give eternity for time, exchanged the glories of an empire for the pickings of an office.

But, whatever may have been their motives, it is a certain fact that Reform obtained from them the first ministerial approbation : till their day it was discountenanced and feared — till their day it was a theme for Parliamentary declamation, and the Utopia of despairing Jacobins ; these Ministers gave it opportunity of action, and invited an exhibition of sentiments which their predecessors had denounced, and themselves had regarded as a fearful instrument of power.

Such, then, was the condition of these two Houses ; and their acts proved entirely accordant with the prevailing temper.

Both of them set upon reforms with an assurance and haughtiness derivable only from consciousness of strength : the Parliament of 1640 knew that the Sovereign was enfeebled almost to decrepitude — his party, originally considerable, had, by various influences, been discouraged or reduced ; and the Reformers displayed their contempt as conciliation became unnecessary.

The Ministers of 1830 are equally arrogant over the weakness of their antagonists : relying upon a majority within doors and a rabble without, they threaten the arguments that they cannot answer. We must all recollect the obstinate silence and disdain they set against the facts and reasoning of the Tories ; well, then, let us see, by reference to

Lord Clarendon's History, how revolutionists advance by similar principles, and, if the instruments be the same, by similar fashions. "In all debates of this nature," says the noble author¹, "where the law, reason, and common sense were directly opposite to what they proposed, they suffered those who differed from them in opinion and purposes to say what they thought fit in opposition; and then, without vouchsafing to endeavour their satisfaction, called importunately for the question, well knowing that they had a plurality of voices to concur with them in whatsoever they desired. I remember, in this last business, when it was voted that a committee should be named to draw up reasons, many of those who had during the debate positively argued against the thing, were called upon to be of that committee; and amongst them, the Lord Falkland, and Mr. Hyde, who stood up, and desired to be excused from that service, where they could be of no use; having given so many reasons against it, that they could not apprehend any could be given for it; therefore thought, the work would be better done, if those who had satisfied themselves with the reasonableness of what they wished, would undertake the converting and disposing of other men.' There was a gentleman who sat by (Mr. Bond of Dorchester; very severe, and resolved, against the Church

¹ Lib. iv.

“ and the Court;) who, with much passion, and
 “ trouble of mind, said to them, ‘ For God’s sake
 “ ‘ be of the committee; you know none of our side
 “ ‘ can give reasons :’ which made those who over-
 “ heard him smile: though he spoke it suddenly;
 “ and upon observation that the leaders were not
 “ then in the House. Otherwise, it cannot be
 “ denied, those who conducted them, and were the
 “ contrivers of the mischief, were men of great
 “ parts, and unspeakable industry; and their
 “ silence in some debates, proceeded partly from
 “ pride, that it might appear their reputation and
 “ interest had an influence upon the sense of the
 “ House, against any rhetorick or logick: but
 “ principally from the policy they were obliged to
 “ use: for, though they could have given a preg-
 “ nant reason for the most extravagant overture
 “ they ever made, and evinced it, that it was the
 “ proper way to their end; yet, it not being time
 “ to discover their purposes (how apparent soever
 “ they were to discerning men) they were neces-
 “ sarily to give no reasons at all; or such as were
 “ not the true ones.”

But the Reformers of those days were not less
 skilled than our own in the mystery of Petitions¹:

¹ “ The Parliament drew up petitions
 To ’tself, and sent them, like commissions,
 To *well-affected* persons down,
 In every city and great town;
 With power to levy horse and men,
 Only to bring them back agen:

they well comprehended that masses of mankind are determined by the winning or losing side ; and how a little contrivance may suffice to pass off the boisterous opinions of a few for the sentiments of thousands.

“ It was a strange disingenuity,” says Lord Clarendon¹, “ that was practised in the procuring
 “ these petitions ; which continued ever after, in
 “ the like addresses. The course was, first to pre-
 “ pare a petition very modest and dutiful, for the
 “ form ; and for the matter, not very unreason-
 “ able ; and to communicate it at some public meet-
 “ ing, where care was taken it should be received
 “ with approbation : the subscription of very few
 “ hands filled the paper itself where the petition
 “ was written ; and, therefore, many more sheets
 “ were annexed for the reception of the number,
 “ which gave all the credit and procured all the
 “ countenance to the undertaking. When a mul-
 “ titude of hands was procured, the petition itself
 “ was cut off, and a new one framed, suitable to
 “ the design in hand, and annexed to the long list
 “ of names which were subscribed to the former.
 “ By this means, many men found their hands
 “ subscribed to petitions of which they before had
 “ never heard.”

For this did many, many a mile,
 Ride manfully in rank and file,
 With papers in their hats, that show'd
 As if they to the pillory rode.”

Hudibras, part i.

¹ Lib. iii.

The petition from Buckinghamshire was escorted to town by four thousand persons, and each man bore the protestation in his hat. "Petitions," says the Parliamentary History, "came now very thick from several counties of England, for a reformation both in Church and State." "We have received many more," said Mr. Pym to the House of Lords, "but I am directed to communicate to your Lordships four especially — from London, Middlesex, Essex, and Hertfordshire."¹

¹ The Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council of London represent that "there is such a decay of trading, and such scarcity of money, as is likely, in very short time, to cast innumerable multitudes of poor artificers into such a depth of poverty and extremity as may enforce them upon some dangerous and desperate attempts, not fit to be expressed, much less to be justified; which they leave to the wisdom of this House speedily to consider and prevent.

"These are the evils under which the petitioners do exceedingly labour and languish; which they humbly conceive to have sprung from the employing of *ill-affected* persons in places of trust and honour in the state, and near to the sacred person of His Majesty; and that those evils are still continued by means of *the votes of Bishops and Popish Lords* in the House of Peers."

In a petition from divers citizens of London, it was prayed, that "grievances may be redressed; the cause of their fears removed; *justice executed upon the said Earl of Strafford, and other incendiaries and offenders*; and the rather, in regard *till then*, the petitioners humbly conceive, neither religion, nor their lives, liberties, nor estates, can be secured."

The county of Essex, after accusing *ill-affected* persons as the cause of "many thousands coming to sudden want," humbly pray that "the Bishops, who have hindered the success of your godly endeavours, may be excluded the House of Peers; not doubting but that *then* our petitions, formerly presented

The petitions were presented:—"My Lords," said

"to this House, will receive the more full and speedy answer." Just so are the people taught to believe of a Reform Parliament. They add, as is also the modern fashion, "We are resolved to assist you in your rights and privileges with our estates and lives, *against the enemies* of God, the King, and State!"

The other petitions run in the same language and sentiment;—so easy is it to make any thing appear a grievance, and then induce multitudes to cry out against it! Substitute "Tories" and "Boroughmongers," &c. wherever accusation is made, and no one will be at a loss to trace existing resemblances.

Now do the people hope for a cheap government! Let them read the testimony of those who favoured Reform in earlier days, and afterwards lived under it:—"This ship-money was generally disliked: myself was then a collector for it in the place I lived in. I remember my proportion was twenty-two shillings, and no more. If we compare the times then, and the present in which I now live, you shall see a great difference even in assessments, the necessity of maintaining our armies requiring it: for now my annual payments to the soldiery are very near, or more than, twenty pounds; my estate being no way greater than formerly."—*Observations on the Life and Death of King Charles, by W. Lilly, Student in Astrology.*

Walker, in speaking of grievances experienced from the committees, as they were called, says, "To historise them at large would require a volume as big as the Book of Martyrs. The people are now generally of opinion, they may as easily find charity in Hell as justice in any Committee; and that the King hath taken down one Star-Chamber, and the Parliament hath set up a hundred."

"These Committees are excellent sponges, to suck money from the people, and to serve, not only their own, but also the covetous, malicious, ambitious ends of those that raked them out of the dunghill for that employment."—*Hist. Independency.*

If any one has leisure, it would be worth his while just to

Mr. Pym¹, “in these four petitions you may hear
“ the voice, or rather the cry, of all England.” So
 are we told at the present day; and our Messrs.
 Pym are equally applauded by the House of Com-
 mons for their daring assertions.

Nor can we perceive that the leading men of

look at a *catalogue raisonné* of placemen under the Common-
 wealth, given in the same work. It would make a monarchist's
 mouth water. We must, however, add the concluding para-
 graph: — “ Besides these offices, commands, and gratuities,
 “ every member of the House of Commons is, by their own
 “ order, allowed four pounds per week a man; which amounts
 “ to one hundred and ten thousand pounds per annum.” Would
 it have been high treason to call them pensions on the Civil
 List?

Hume says, “ It appears that the late King's revenue, from
 “ 1637 to the meeting of the Long Parliament, was only
 “ 900,000*l.* :” in 1657, the whole of “ the taxes might, at a
 “ medium, amount to about 2,000,000*l.* a year; a sum which
 “ much exceeded the revenue of any former King. Crom-
 “ well died more than 2,000,000*l.* in debt, though the Parlia-
 “ ment had left him in the treasury above 500,000*l.*, and in
 “ stores the value of 700,000*l.*”

And yet Hobbes, in his *Behemoth*, when describing the
 temper of the people of England at the election of 1640, says,
 “ He was thought wisest and fittest to be chosen for a member
 “ of Parliament, who was most averse to the granting of sub-
 “ sidies, or other public payments.” (So it was in 1830.) The
 people must have been astonished at their first efforts in eco-
 nomy!

¹ Among other “ evil influences,” he stated “ the great
 “ power that an *interested* and *factionous* party hath in the Par-
 “ liament, by the continuance of the votes of the Bishops and
 “ Popish Lords in your Lordships' House.”

“ The fomenting and cherishing of a *malignant party* through-
 “ out the whole kingdom.” For this speech he received the
 thanks of the House of Commons!

1640 and 1831 differ at all in will or power upon the next great step of the revolutionary process; INTIMIDATION. A most pestilent work has been lately printed, in which instruments of violence bear the explanatory motto, "*Ratio ultima regum*:" we accept the compliment in the name of the King, and avail ourselves of the opportunity to remark, that the "*ratio ultima*" of our mixed system is the "*ratio prima*" of the democratic: we have seen its substance in the occurrences of the last fourteen months, and its principles in the columns of *The Times*, that Ministerial print, supposed to be under the peculiar divinity of Lord Hudibras and Vaux.

It has always been the practice of revolutionists to vilify their opponents by a nickname; which, being bandied from mouth to mouth, imbibes the malignity of each speaker, and furnishes to the multitude a compendious argument to justify any violence of language or action. Thus, in France they embodied every vice under the appellation of "*aristocrats*;" in England of 1640, under that of "*malignants*;" in England of 1830, of "*borough-mongers*." Any one whose principles were conservative, or his conduct loyal, — any one, in short, who exhibited an unwillingness to go whole lengths with them, — was classed as a *malignant*, and pronounced an enemy¹ to his country, and a traitor

¹ The forms of law were held too good for them; the bill of attainder against Lord Strafford was resisted in the Lords; but lest "what had been said on the Earl's behalf in point of law,

to the King. So is it with us : let any one reperuse the radical newspapers, the speeches in Parliament, the speeches at public meetings, “ *the whisper of a faction,*” and he will find not only the same sentiments, but actually the same language. It would be tedious to make extracts in confirmation of our statements — the sounds are still ringing in every ear, and honest hearts still beat with indignation.

It was then, as it is now, a most admired policy to render all constitutional opposition invidious, and frighten timid men from a discharge of their duty. The Bill of Attainder against Lord Strafford was sent to the Peers : — “ The same day, *as a better argument to the Lords* speedily to pass the “ Bill, the nine and fifty members of the House of “ Commons who had dissented from that Act had “ their names written in pieces of parchment or

“ and upon the want of proof, should have made any impression on their Lordships, he (Mr. Solicitor St. John) averred “ that, in that way of bill, private satisfaction to each man’s “ conscience was sufficient, although no evidence had been “ given in at all : and as to the pressing the law, he said, it was “ true we give laws to hares and deer, because they are beasts “ of chase ; but it was never accounted either cruelty or foul “ play to knock foxes and wolves on the head, as they can be “ found, because they are beasts of prey.” — *Hist. Reb.* b. iii. *Radical Reform* in Courts of Justice !

“ They (the Lords) were awed partly also by the House of “ Commons itself, which, if it desired to undo a Lord, had no “ more to do than to vote him a *delinquent*.

“ *A.* A delinquent; what’s that? a sinner, is it? Did they “ mean to undo all sinners?

“ *B.* By a delinquent they meant only a man to whom they “ would do all the hurt they could.” — *Behemoth*.

“ paper, under this superscription — ‘ STRAFFORD-
 “ ‘ IANS,’ OR ENEMIES TO THEIR COUNTRY; and these
 “ papers fixed upon posts, and other most visible
 “ places about the city; which was as great and
 “ destructive a violation of the privileges and free-
 “ dom of Parliament as can be imagined: yet being
 “ complained of in the House, not the least coun-
 “ tenance was given to the complaints, or the least
 “ care taken for the discovery.”¹

How often have we seen sundry Members of the House engaged in taking lists of those who voted, in any way, against the popular feeling! Lists, corrected lists in black and red, spread far and wide the names of the opponents to the Reform Bill; and the Hudibrastic Journal presented, in its columns, an analysis of the lives of the conservative party.

But it was necessary to give some outward visible signs of *ulterior measures*. In May, 1641, the Queen’s mother was threatened; and the mob “ talked of coming the next day into St. James’s Fields.” Again: “ The disorders of the multitude “ were much increased; there had marched towards “ the Tower a thousand sailors and others who “ pulled down the houses.” — This called forth an order “ to prohibit tumults,” — that is, a *proclamation*: they denounced the riots of their own exciting. — The tumults, however, got worse; the Commons agreed with the Lords “ in apprehension of

¹ Lord Clarendon, lib. iii.

“ danger: but fearing that all care that can be
 “ used may prove insufficient for the assurance of
 “ her protection, and desirous to prevent the
 “ blemish that may fall upon the nation by any ill
 “ accident, the Commons do entreat their Lord-
 “ ships humbly to represent these things to His
 “ Majesty, that the Queen¹ may be moved to de-
 “ part this kingdom;” or, in other words, that in
 order to rescuing so great a person from personal
 danger, the Duke of Wellington be induced to re-
 tire from office.

The Revolutionists as much dreaded justice in
 the case of Lord Strafford, as our Ministers now
 dread returning sense in the people: agitation was
 the remedy for both. We shall give the account
 from the Parliamentary History: — “ Very early
 “ in the morning there met, about Westminster Hall,
 “ a great number of citizens, 5000 or thereabouts,
 “ being, for the most part, men of good² fashion,
 “ who, as the Lords and Parliament-men came by,
 “ made a lane for them to pass with their coaches,
 “ calling upon them for justice against the Earl of
 “ Strafford and others; *complaining that they were*
 “ *undone through the want of due execution thereof;*

¹ Unpopular, because represented to be popishly affected.

² But Mr. Whitlocke calls them a “rabble of about 6000 out
 of the city, who came thronging down to Westminster, armed
 with swords, cudgels, and staves. He imputes this tumult to
the pulpits (the press of those days), from some of which had
 been preached to the people the day before the necessity of
 justice upon some great delinquents now to be acted.” — *Me-
 morials*.

“and that trading was so decayed thereby, that
 “they could scarce get bread to maintain their
 “families.” Now is there a man who does not
 recognise in this last sentence the inflammatory de-
 lusions which have so prevailed among the lower
 sort, and made them so eager for *Reform*?¹

It continues: “The Lords generally gave them
 “good words; amongst whom the Lord High
 “Steward, upon whom they called with greatest
 “clamour, went out of his coach, some other of
 “the Lords being with him, and with his hat² in
 “his hand, prayed them to be quiet, and what lay
 “in his power should be done; and he would like-
 “wise move His Majesty, that justice might be
 “executed according to their requests.”—Again:
 “When the Earl of Holland came out to take
 “coach, they redoubled their cry; and, coming up
 “to the Earl of Bristol’s coach, some of them told
 “him, For you, my Lord of Bristol, we know you
 “are an apostate from the cause of Christ, and our
 “mortal enemy; we *do not therefore crave justice*
 “*from you, but shall shortly crave justice upon you,*
 “*and your false son, the Earl Digby.*”³

¹ “If the Revenue has, therefore, fallen off in the last Quar-
 “ter, the opponents of the great measure of Reform, who have
 “so long kept the nation in a ferment, are alone to blame,
 “and may add a deficient national income to the other offences
 “for which they are responsible at the bar of the public.” —
Times, Jan. 6. 1832.

² Lord Milton and his great coat at Northampton!

³ Clarendon, p. 201. “The next day great multitudes of
 “people came down to Westminster, and crowded about the

In the same way, the Dissolution of Parliament threw the people back into the fever from which they were recovering ; the violence at the elections alarmed the nervous, and drove them from the field ; and Ministers, by stifling reason, obtained a majority. These respective triumphs over Lord Strafford and common sense, were celebrated in similar rejoicings. Sir Philip Warwick, a contemporary, and probably an eye-witness, says — “ To

“ House of Peers, exclaiming, with great outcries, ‘ that they
 “ ‘ would have justice ;’ and publicly reading the names of
 “ those who had dissented from the Bill in the House of Com-
 “ mons as enemies to their country ; and, as any Lord passed
 “ by, called *Justice ! Justice !* and with great rudeness and
 “ insolence pressing upon and thrusting those Lords whom
 “ they suspected not to favour that Bill ; professing aloud,
 “ ‘ that they would be governed and disposed by the honour-
 “ ‘ able House of Commons.’ These unheard of acts of inso-
 “ lence and sedition continued so many days till many Lords
 “ *grew so really apprehensive of having their brains beaten out,*
 “ that they absented themselves from the House ; and others,
 “ finding what seconds the House of Commons was like to
 “ have to compass whatever they desired, changed their minds ;
 “ and so, in an afternoon, when, of the fourscore who had
 “ been present at the trial, there were only six and forty
 “ Lords in the House (the good people still crying at the
 “ doors for justice), they put the Bill to the question, and
 “ eleven Lords only dissenting, it passed that House, and was
 “ ready for the King’s assent.

“ The King continued as resolved as ever not to give his
 “ consent ; the same oratory then attended him at Whitehall
 “ which had prevailed at Westminster ; and a rabble of many
 “ thousand people besieged that place, crying out, ‘ *Justice,*
 “ ‘ *Justice ! that they would have justice ;*’ not without great
 “ and insolent threats and expressions, *what they would do if it*
 “ *were not speedily granted.*”

“ show how mad this whole people were, especially
 “ in and about this then bloody and brutish city
 “ (London), in the evening of the day wherein he
 “ (Lord Strafford) was executed, the greatest de-
 “ monstrations of joy that possibly could be ex-
 “ pressed ran through the whole town and coun-
 “ tries hereabout; and many that came up to town
 “ on purpose to see the execution, rode in triumph
 “ back, waving their hats, and with all expressions
 “ of joy, through every town they went, crying,
 “ ‘ His head is off! his head is off!’ *and in many*
 “ *places committing insolencies upon, and breaking*
 “ *the windows of, those persons who would not so-*
 “ *lemnize this festival with a bonfire.* So ignorant
 “ and brutish is a multitude.” Now we of the
 present day must perfectly bear in mind the illu-
 minations devised by the Lord Mayor Key, and the
 outrages committed on the houses of those who
 entertained obnoxious opinions.

But there was more to be effected, nor could
 it be done without further agitations; the parlia-
 mentary leaders had determined to oust the Bishops
 from the House of Lords. We shall give the en-
 tire passage¹: — “ This², and such stuff, being
 “ printed and scattered amongst the people, multi-
 “ tudes of mean persons flocked to Westminster
 “ Hall, and about the Lords’ House, crying as they
 “ went up and down, ‘ *No Bishops! No Bishops!*’ ”³

¹ Clarendon, lib. iv.

² A petition published, in the name of the apprentices, against prelates.

³ Bishop Hall, speaking in the House of Lords, said, “ I be-

“ that so they might carry on Reformation.”
 “ When the disorderly rabble, spoke of now, first
 “ came down, they resisted them, and would not
 “ suffer them to disturb the Houses ; and some of
 “ them, with great rudeness, pressing to the door
 “ of the House of Peers, their Lordships appointed
 “ the Guards to be called up to remove them ; and
 “ the Earl of Dorset, being then Lord Lieutenant
 “ of Middlesex, (the crowd oppressing him, and re-
 “ fusing to leave the room,) in some passion, called
 “ upon the Guard ‘ to give fire upon them,’ where-
 “ upon the rabble, frightened, left the place, and
 “ hasted away.

“ The House of Commons, incensed that their
 “ friends should be so used, much inveighed against

“ seech you to consider, what it is that there should be in
 “ London no fewer than fourscore congregations of several
 “ sectaries, as I have been credibly informed, instructed by
 “ guides fit for them ; cobblers, tailors, felt-makers, and such
 “ like trash, which are all taught to spit in the face of their
 “ mother, the Church of England, and to defy and revile her
 “ Government. From hence have issued those dangerous
 “ assaults of our church-governors ; from hence that inundation
 “ of base and scurrilous libels and pamphlets wherewith we
 “ have been of late overborne.” . . “ If these lawless outrages be
 “ yet suffered to gather head, who knows where they will end ?
 “ My Lords, if these men may, with impunity and freedom, thus
 “ bear down *ecclesiastical authority*, it is to be feared they will
 “ not rest there, but will be ready to affront civil power too. Your
 “ Lordships know that the *Jack Straws*, and *Cades*, and *Wat*
 “ *Tylers* of former times did not more cry down learning than
 “ nobility!!!” — *Hall's Works*, folio, 1683.

This speech has an additional interest, as being the last made
 in that House by one of his order.

“ the Earl of Dorset, and talked ‘ of accusing him
 “ ‘ of high treason,’ at least ‘ of drawing up some
 “ ‘ impeachment against him,’ for some judgment
 “ he had been party to in the Star-Chamber or
 “ council table.

“ It was quickly understood abroad that the
 “ Commons liked well the visits of their neigh-
 “ bours ; so that the people assembled in greater
 “ numbers than before about the House of Peers,
 “ calling still out, with one voice, ‘ *No Bishops! No*
 “ ‘ *Popish Lords!*’ crowded and affronted such Lords
 “ as came near them, who they knew affected not
 “ their ends, calling them ‘ *rotten-hearted Lords.*’ ”
 It proceeds : — “ The tumults continued, and their
 “ insolences increased, insomuch as many dissolute
 “ and profane people went into the abbey at
 “ Westminster, and would have pulled down the
 “ organs and some ornaments of the church ; but
 “ being resisted, and by force driven out, they
 “ threatened ‘ they would come with greater num-
 “ ‘ bers, and pull down the church.’

“ Hereupon the Lords send again to the House
 “ of Commons to join with them in their declar-
 “ ation ; and many members of that House com-
 “ plained ‘ that they could not come with safety
 “ ‘ to that House ;’ and that ‘ some of them had been
 “ ‘ assaulted and very ill entertained by those people
 “ ‘ that crowded about the door.’ But this confer-
 “ ence could not be procured, the debate being
 “ still put off to some other time, after several
 “ speeches had been made in justification of them,

“ and commendation of their affections ; some say-
 “ ing, ‘ they must not discourage their friends, this
 “ ‘ being a time they must make use of all friends ;’
 “ Mr. Pym himself saying, ‘ *God forbid the House*
 “ ‘ *of Commons should proceed in any way to dis-*
 “ ‘ *hearten people to obtain their just desires in such*
 “ ‘ *a way.*’ ”¹

After the rejection of the Bill by the House of Lords, the revolutionary party felt great alarm lest

¹ The reader will thank us for giving him an extract from a small pamphlet, entitled *Hard Measure*, printed in Bishop Hall’s Works : — “ The rout did not stick openly to profess
 “ that they would pull the Bishops in pieces. Messages were
 “ sent down to them from the Lords ; but they still held firm,
 “ both to the place and their bloody resolutions. It now grew
 “ to be torch-light, and one of the Lords (the Marquis of Hert-
 “ ford) came up to the Bishop’s form, and told us we were in
 “ great danger, advising us to take some course for our own
 “ safety ; and, being desired to tell us what he thought the
 “ best way, counselled us to continue in the Parliament House
 “ all that night : ‘ For,’ said he, ‘ these people vow they will
 “ ‘ watch you at your going out, and will search every coach
 “ ‘ for you with torches, so as you cannot escape.’ Hereupon
 “ the House of Lords was moved for some order for the pre-
 “ venting these mutinous and riotous meetings, and messages
 “ were sent down to the House of Commons, to this purpose,
 “ more than once ; but nothing was effected. However, for the
 “ present (for so much as all the danger was at the rising of the
 “ House), it was earnestly desired of the Lords that some care
 “ might be taken of our safety. The motion was received by
 “ some Lords with a smile ; some other Lords, as the Earl of
 “ Manchester, undertook the protection of the Archbishop of
 “ York, and his company (whose shelter I went under), to their
 “ lodgings. The rest, some of them by their long stay, others
 “ by secret and far-fetched passages, escaped home : therefore
 “ it was not for us to venture any more to the House without
 “ some better assurance.”

the country should acquiesce in that spirited decision. We had, therefore, a renewal of their never-failing agitation ; correspondence was opened with Political Unions : Nottingham, Derby, and Bristol gave a succession of tumults, each surpassing the other in atrocity. The Bishops were marked out for personal insult from mob and Ministers ; nor did the Press relax its efforts to endanger the existence of the order by identifying their destruction with the sports of the rabble.¹

There never was wanting in those times (so neither in these) any one to imagine and propose the most impudent measures, if they but promised the smallest chance of success. It must be fresh in every one's memory that Sir F. Burdett gravely suggested the exclusion of all borough members from the debates on Reform ; nor was he rebuked by the Minister.² This proposition was extended by the out-door powers to the "borough-mongering "Lords" in the Upper House. Had they learned this from the precedent of that temperate gentleman, Mr. Pym, who, in a conference with the Peers, declared that "the Commons had commanded "him and his colleague to present a proposition to "their Lordships, *that all the Bishops may be suspended from their votes upon that Bill, entitled "An Act to disable all Persons in Holy Orders*

¹ By hinting that the Bishops should henceforward be substitutes for the effigies of Guy Fawkes.

² But most admirably so by Sir C. Wetherell.

“ to exercise any Jurisdiction or Authority temporal ! ”

It has been very much the cant of the present day (for we can call it nothing else) to quote the straight affections of the people, in answer to the alleged incompatibility of Reform with an hereditary legislative body. The people, it is said, desirous of their own rights, have no wish whatever to trench upon others ; they respect the Lords and admire the Constitution as established in three estates, and wish, nay, demand, that the privileges of each should enjoy unabated operation.

In vain have we urged the nature of the democratic principle, and set forth its practice in the final abolition of the peerage. The Reformers reply, that this measure was not effected until the Parliament had passed into other hands, or, as we say, had been reformed in accordance with predominant powers. But if we refer back to antecedent periods, we shall find the very essence of a peerage questioned, their condition insulted, their privileges set aside, and the right of individuals to control the national will openly disputed by authority of the Commons.

The republican principle was rife, but it wanted power : the Constitution had means, even in troublous times, to make itself obeyed ; and had not the force of the army been added to the Commons, the hereditary Peers might have saved the empire. So it is with us. Reform, as a great increase of strength, must operate on the House of Lords as

did the army in 1648; and we shall have another example how designs are set forth in moderation, and fulfilled with violence.

We do not hesitate to assert, that the progress of the future has been clearly chalked out by the events of the past, and that as it was with our forefathers, so will it be with us and our children. So long as the House of Lords concurred with the Commons and the democratic voice, there was perfect harmony of feeling and expression; but no sooner had the Peers ventured either to dissent altogether, or tarry in their approval, than the popular leaders saw the Constitution in another light. In January, 1642, when the Lords hesitated to give effect to some measures from the Commons, Mr. Pym, in a conference, thus expressed himself¹: — “ I am now come to a conclusion; and I have nothing to propound to your Lordships, by way of request or desire, from the House of Commons. I doubt not but your judgments will tell you what is to be done: your consciences, your honours, your interests, will call upon you for the doing of it. The Commons will be glad to have your concurrence and help in saving the kingdom; but if they fail of it, it should not discourage them in doing their duty: and whether the kingdom be lost or saved, (but I hope, through God’s blessing, it will be saved,) they shall be sorry that the story of this

¹ His “ Friendly Advice to the Lords!!”

“ present Parliament should tell posterity, that, in
 “ so great danger and extremity, the House of
 “ Commons *should be enforced to save the kingdom*
 “ *alone*, and that the House of Peers should have
 “ no part in the honour of the preservation of it ;
 “ you having so great an interest in the good suc-
 “ cess of those endeavours, in respect of your great
 “ estates and high degrees of nobility.”

This speech received the thanks of the Speaker in the name of the Commons' House.

This same gentleman, who, from his talents and experience had justly a lead in the popular counsels, made likewise a motion, “ *That the major part of the House of Commons, and the minor part of the Lords, might be esteemed as an authentic concurrence of both Houses.*”

But the Lords, though frequently humiliated, insisted occasionally on their constitutional privileges ; whereupon the Commons went ¹ so far as openly tell the Lords, “ that they themselves were
 “ the representative body of the whole kingdom,
 “ and that the Peers were nothing but individuals,
 “ who held their seats in a particular capacity ;
 “ and therefore, if their Lordships will not consent
 “ to the passing of Acts necessary for the preserv-
 “ ation of the people, the Commons, together with
 “ such of the Lords as are more sensible of the
 “ danger, must join together, and represent the
 “ matter to His Majesty.”

¹ Hume's History.

The agitators then resorted to their old system of petitions, and invited the rabble to give judgment on difficult points of religion and government.¹ A petition was presented from the young men, apprentices, and seamen; another from the poor tradesmen and manufacturers; and a third from

- ¹ “ Did they, for this, draw down the rabble,
 With zeal, and noises formidable;
 And make all cries about the town
 Join throats to cry the Bishops down?
 Who having round begirt the palace,
 (As once a month they do the gallows,)
 As members gave the sign about,
 Set up their throats with hideous shout.
 When tinkers bawl'd aloud to settle
 Church-discipline for patching kettle:
 No sow-gelder did blow his horn
 To geld a cat, but cry'd *Reform*.
 The oyster-women lock'd their fish up,
 And trudg'd away, to cry, No Bishop!
 The mouse-trap men laid save-alls by,
 And 'gainst ev'l counsellors did cry.
 Butchers left old cloaths in the lurch,
 And fell to turn and patch the Church.
 Some cry'd the Covenant, instead
 Of pudding-pies and ginger-bread.
 And some for brooms, old boots and shoes.
 Bawl'd out to purge the Common-House:
 Instead of kitchen-stuff, some cry
 A Gospel-preaching Ministry:
 And some for old suits, coats, or cloak,
 No surplices nor service-book.
 A strange harmonious inclination
 Of all degrees to *reformation*.”

Butler's Hudibras, canto ii. vol. i. p. 147.

What is the difference between those times and the present?

the porters of London: and they were most graciously received by the House.

In a petition from “thousands of poor people in
“and about London,” it was urged that “those
“noble worthies of the House of Peers who concur
“with your happy votes, may be earnestly desired
“to join with this Honourable House, and to sit
“and vote as one entire¹ body, which, we hope,
“will remove from us our destructive fears, and
“prevent that which apprehension will make the
“wisest and peaceablest men to put in execution.”

This also was most graciously received, and thanks were ordered to be given to the petitioners for their “great kindness.” “To the which, when
“it was delivered by the Speaker, who told them
“that the House was in consideration of those
“things whereof they complained, some of that
“rabble, no doubt, as they had been taught, replied, ‘that they never doubted the House of
“‘Commons, but they heard *it stuck in the Lords’*
“‘*House*, and they *desired to know the name of*
“‘*those Peers* who hindered the agreement between
“‘the good Lords and the Commons.’”²

The delicacy of the popular leaders, and their nervous sensitiveness to the constitutional rights of all, may be fairly estimated by a speech of Mr. Hollis to the Peers, wherein he “desired to know
“the names of such members as should vote con-

¹ A curious coincidence with the proposal of the Tiers Etat at the commencement of the French Revolution!

² Clarendon, lib. iv.

“trary to the sentiments of the Commons ;” and a speech also of Mr. Pym’s, who, in alluding to the violence of the rabble, declared that “*the people must not be restrained in the expressions of their just desires.*”

This is history, and written in so large letters that any one who runs may read. We cannot study these things, and acknowledge the constitutional forbearance of the Commons ; as little can we listen to or peruse the language¹ of the last twelve months in the House and in the country, and entertain the slightest hope that the privileges of the Peers will stand for an instant against the tide of unqualified representation.

The ancient proverb of “Give a man an inch and he will take an ell” had a practical illustration in the concessions of King Charles, and it is preparing to enjoy an equal illustration in the concessions of King William. We are hourly told, that the passing of Reform will tranquillise the country ; nor do we question its momentary effects ; for a people, like an individual, may pause while in exhaustion and astonishment ; but we deny altogether its remedial power. The Revolutionists will commence upon the basis of a reformed Parliament, and declare that Reform was always intended as the engine, not the object, of their desires. We have precedents to that effect.

¹ *Vide* leading articles, speeches at town meetings, county meetings, &c. *passim*.

“ *After the passing of these two Bills¹,*” says Lord Clarendon², “the temper and spirit of the people, both within and without the walls of the two Houses, *grew marvellous calm and composed* ; there being likewise, about that time, passed by the King, the two Bills for taking away the Star-Chamber Court, and the High Commission : so that there was not a grievance or inconvenience, real or imaginary, to which there was not a thorough remedy applied ; and, therefore, all men expected that both armies would be speedily disbanded ; and such returns of duty and acknowledgment be made to the King, *as might be agreeable to their professions*, and to the royal favours he had vouchsafed to his people.”

But it turned out otherwise : this Parliament, now rendered immortal, except from suicide, converted its new powers into an instrument of aggression. The case of tonnage and poundage followed ; a Bill was revived for extirpating episcopacy, and Sir Arthur Haselrigge³ offered to settle the militia ; then came an insolent remonstrance⁴ to the King against the appointment to vacant

¹ Bill of Attainder, and Act for continuing the Parliament.

² Lib. iii.

³ And yet so outrageous a Bill, that Clarendon remarks, “ When the title of this Bill was read it gave so general an offence to the House, that it seemed inclined to throw it out, without suffering it to be read, not without some reproach to the person that brought it in, ‘ as a matter of sedition.’ ” The Bill, however, was read, though it stopped there for a time.

⁴ Mr. Hume and the Bishopric of Derry !

sees; the Irish Pressing Bill, and a total usurpation of the executive functions.

These measures, proposed within a very short period after such satisfactory concessions, were, as is well known, ultimately carried; yet each measure successively was held out, in appearance, as a "final settlement." "In the Bill for the Triennial Parliament, there were some clauses very derogatory to monarchical principles; yet His Majesty, really intending to make these conventions frequent, without any great hesitation, enacted those two Bills together; *so much to the seeming joy and satisfaction of both Houses, that they pretended 'to have sufficiently provided for 'the security of the Commonwealth; and that 'there remained nothing to be done, but such a 'return of duty and gratitude to the King, as 'might testify their devotions; and that their 'only end was to make him glorious.'* But those fits of zeal and loyalty never lasted long."¹

Sir John Wray, in his speech, seems to comprise every happiness in the death of the Earl of Strafford: — "Let us be well advised," said he, "what to do, in case we shall be denied justice in this particular, *upon which depends not only the happiness, but the safety of this Parliament, of this kingdom, of ourselves, and of our posterities.*" The petition from divers citizens of London held the same language: many of the

¹ Clarendon, lib. iii.

Privy Council urged the King to pass the Bill of Attainder, saying, — “ *There was no other way to preserve himself and his posterity than by so doing,*” and therefore he ought to be more tender of the “ safety of the kingdom than of any one person, how innocent soever.”¹ This unfortunate Prince was advised to the overthrow of justice, and his own honour, lest the Parliament should trouble the kingdom; and even so our present Ministers have given counsel to undermine the foundations, lest the rabble should attack the superstructure. Sir Harry Vane, in a speech upon the “ unhappy condition the civil state is in, whilst Bishops have votes in the House of Lords,” says, “ their rooting up must be *our only cure*. Let us then, with one heart and resolution, give glory to God, in complying with his providence, for the good *safety* and peace of his *Church and State*, which *will be* by passing this Bill we are now upon.”²

¹ Clarendon, lib. iii.

² After this Bill had been passed, *another* was brought forward against the Bishops. The King was persuaded that “ the passing of this Bill was the *only* way to preserve the Church; there being so united a combination in this particular that he would not be able to withstand it: whereas by the passing this Bill so many persons would be fully satisfied, that they *would join in no farther alteration*; but, on the other hand, if they were crossed in this, they would violently endeavour an extirpation of Bishops, and a demolishing of the whole fabric of the Church.” The King consented to the Bill; and soon after this “ final settlement ” of the question, Episcopacy was abolished by solemn vote! And how much shall we get

When the Bill had reached the House of Lords, it was most ably resisted by the Bishop of Lincoln, who urged the irrefutable argument, that “if they
 “may remove Bishops, they will next time remove
 “Barons and Earls.” To this it was replied, by Lord Say and Sele, “The reason is not the same :
 “the one sitting by an honour invested in their
 “blood, and hereditary ; which, though it be in the
 “King to grant alone, yet, being once granted, he
 “cannot take away : the other sitting by a Barony
 “depending upon an office which may be taken
 “away ; for if they be deprived of their office
 “they sit not.”

This same answer is daily given to reasoners on conservative principles ; and the intrinsic value of it was proved *by the abolition of the Peerage, a very few years after the expulsion of the Bishops !*

In all circumstances of difficulty and terror, men

by conciliation, as it is called, and bringing *moderate men* over to our side!!!

Even the great Lord Falkland was for a time, deceived by this hope of a “final settlement.” He gave his support at first to the Bill against the Bishops ; “when the same argument came into debate again, about six months after, he
 “changed his opinion : nor was he reserved in acknowledging
 “that he had been deceived, and by whom ; and confessed to
 “his friends, that Mr. Hampden had assured him, that if that
 “bill might pass, there would be nothing more attempted to
 “the prejudice of the Church ; which he thought, as the world
 “then went, would be no ill composition.” — *Hist. Reb.* lib. iii. So, many *moderates* are for compounding by the surrender of Schedule A !

are ready to compound for a temporary security, mistaking, as they oftentimes do, strong hope for conviction ; but, either in ignorance of human nature, or impatience to be freed from their alarms, they do not sufficiently consider whether their concessions be of measures or principle. A specific grievance, real or imaginary, being redressed, the operation of change may be terminated ; but the concession of a principle has no bounds but those of the principle itself ; and the politician who yields, be he right or wrong, must be prepared for the full extent of the principle he has conceded.

The principles of unqualified representation conceded by the Minister have already begun to develop their results. King Charles was called upon to expel the Bishops, as opposing, by their votes, “ the desires of the People ; ” King William is called upon to adulterate the Peerage, because, in its purity, it opposes “ the desires of the People : ” thus the principle of unqualified Representation is gaining the ascendant over the law of constitutional control ; and the Minister, it is said, will listen to the cry : yet who is to be judge of the manner in which the Constitution must be handled ? The Minister ! Why, then, was the Duke of Wellington dismissed for treating it according to *his* principles ! The People ! Why, then, are they denied universal suffrage ? The middling Classes ! Why, then, are the decisions of their representatives to be subjected to the revision of an hereditary Peerage ?

The Patriots of those days, no less than of these, owned the soft impeachment of place and power. If we allow to some the character of error and good intentions, we must recognise in others the adoption of Reform as an engine of office: "the malignants were ruining the country," and so were the "Boroughmongers; it would be wrong to entertain our scruples any further. Quintus Curtius was a voluntary sacrifice for the good of his country; let every Whig be a Quintus Curtius!" "The great Patriots," says Clarendon, "thought they might be able to do their country better service if they got the places and preferments of the Court for themselves, and so prevent the evil counsels which had used to spring from thence."

In this way the unfortunate King was surrounded by revolutionary Ministers, and even the *Law officer* of the Crown, *Mr. Solicitor* St. John, held, it was known, opinions adverse to the Monarchy.

In all revolutions the aggressors are the more active party, and at the present day it is painful to observe their superior alertness. We hold most decidedly the opinion, and apply it to this and all other periods, that if conservative principles were upheld with only a portion of the vigour exerted to undermine them, the world would be spared many scenes of anarchy. We are content with the fact, and need not tarry to investigate its causes; for our purpose it is sufficient to trace, in both periods, a similar activity, and a similar supineness: itinerant Jacobins roam through the coun-

try, yet we hear no counteracting eloquence ; county meetings are assembled to speak the sense of the freeholders, and no Tory will attend them¹ ; the revolutionary press is abhorred and encouraged ; combinations are formed, we still remain dispersed ; and while our enemies execute various methods of attack, we are talking of the best methods of resistance, and leave others to perform them.

It is doubtless very wearying to attend the deliberations every night in succession ; our adversaries know it, and act accordingly : their predecessors of 1640 did the same ; they compelled the House to sit upon *Saturdays*, “drove away a great number “of old and infirm opposers,” carried Bills in thin Houses, and by the perpetual sitting of the Commons (with shorter intervals even than in our time) acquired for that House the executive power : in our day Members are but a trifle more attentive ; Sir R. Peel’s best speech² was delivered to a ragged House ; the Committee on the Reform Bill, after the decision of the Schedules, was scanty in conservatives ; and the second reading of the new measure, in December last, was most contrary to the wishes of several Members, who were then

¹ “Every man thinking it high merit in him, that he absented himself from the company and place where all the mischief was done, and that the keeping himself negatively innocent was as much as he owed his King and Country.” — *Clarendon*, lib. v.

² On Schedule B.

proving upon a fox or a partridge what they would do to a Radical.¹

¹ “ It was so late every day before the House was resumed, “ (the Speaker commonly leaving the Chair about nine of the “ clock, and never resuming it till four in the afternoon,) that it “ was very thin ; they only, who prosecuted the Bill with im- “ patience, remaining in the House ; and the others, who ab- “ horred it, growing weary of so tiresome an attendance, left “ the House at dinner time, and afterwards followed their plea- “ sures : so that the Lord Falkland was wont to say, ‘ that they “ ‘ who hated Bishops, hated them worse than the Devil ; and “ ‘ that they who loved them, did not love them so well as “ ‘ their dinner.’ ” — *Clarendon*, book iii.

“ It will be wondered at hereafter, when, by what hath been “ said, the number and quality of the Peers is considered, who, “ by absenting themselves from the House, and their resort to “ His Majesty, sufficiently declared, that they liked not those “ conclusions which begot those distractions ; why both those “ Peers, and likewise such Members of the Commons, who then “ and afterwards appeared in the King’s service, and were indeed “ full or very near one moiety of that House, did not rather, by “ their diligent and faithful attendance in the Houses, according “ to their several trusts reposed in them, discountenance and re- “ sist those pernicious and fatal transactions, than, by withdraw- “ ing themselves from their proper stations, leave the other “ (whose ruinous intentions were sufficiently discovered) pos- “ sessed of the reputation, authority, and power of a Parlia- “ ment ; by which, it was evident, the people would be easily, “ to a great degree, seduced. And though the observing Reader “ may, upon the collection of the several passages here set down, “ be able to answer those objections to himself ; I am the rather “ induced, in this place, to apply myself to the clearing that “ point, because not only many honest men, who, at a distance, “ have considered it, without being privy to the passages within “ the walls, and those breaches which fatally destroyed, and took “ away the liberty and freedom of those Councils, have been “ really troubled, or unsatisfied with that desertion, as they call

We cannot repose in confidence on the loyalty of the kingdom, though we fully admit it; virtue misdirected may produce as much cause for sorrow as the most stubborn vice; but loyalty was not wanting even in the days of Charles: "The greatest part of the Lords in Parliament," says Hobbes, "and of the gentry throughout England, were more affected to a Monarchy than a popular Government; but so as not to endure to hear of the King's

"it, of the service to which they were incumbent, and chosen; but that I have heard some, who were the chief, if not the sole promoters of those violations, and the most violent designs, and have since (out of the ruptures which have proceeded from their own animosities) either been, or been thought to be, more moderately inclined, complain, 'that the withdrawing of so many Members from the two Houses, was the principal cause of all calamities.' And they who have been the true authors of them, and still continue the same men, have taken pains to make and declare the others 'Deserters of their country, and betrayers of their trusts, by their voluntary withdrawing themselves from that Council.'

"In the doing whereof, I shall not, I cannot, make any excuse for those (of whom somewhat is before spoken) who, from the beginning of this Parliament, and in the whole progress of it, either out of laziness, or negligence, or incogitancy, or weariness, forbore to give their attendance there, when the number of those who really intended those prodigious alterations was very inconsiderable; and daily drew many to their opinions, upon no other ground than that the number of the dissenters appeared not equally diligent, and intent upon their assertions: neither can I excuse the Peers, the moderate part whereof being four for one, suffered themselves to be cousened, and perswaded, and threatened out of their rights by a handful of men, whom they might, in the beginning, easily have crushed." — *Clarendon's History of the Rebellion*, vol. i. Part ii. page 661. This may serve for advice to Peers in Committee!

“ absolute power.” Nor does Clarendon¹ say otherwise. “ In the House of Commons were many “ persons of wisdom and gravity, who, being possessed of great and plentiful fortunes, though they “ were undevoted enough to the Court, had all imaginable duty for the King, and affection to the “ Government established by law² or ancient custom; and without doubt, the major part of that “ body consisted of men who had no mind to break “ the peace of the kingdom, or to make any considerable alteration in the government³ of Church or “ State.” But no better proof can be given that such sentiments prevailed throughout the country, and do now prevail, than the constant and necessary use of the name of the King. Petitions and addresses, now as then, are filled with sentences of the most

¹ Lib. iii.

² The petition from Somersetshire, in June, 1642, is a pattern of moderation and sound loyalty. Nor is the letter from the gentry of Nottinghamshire to their representatives less so.

³ It is curious to observe the rapid progress of opinions, and the manner in which persons become habituated to the contemplation of any measures. In the outset of the Long Parliament, a petition was presented, praying for the “ total extirpation of Episcopacy;” yet the House (says Clarendon, lib.iii.) was so far “ from being possessed with that spirit, that “ the utmost that could be obtained, upon a long debate upon “ that petition, was, *that it should not be rejected*, — it was only suffered to remain in the hands of the Clerk of the House, with direction *that no copy of it should be given*.” In less than a year afterwards, the House went mad on the abolition of Episcopacy. Now, what they said on the first petition against Episcopacy, we say on the petitions for *ballot*; but that question will make advances.

extravagant loyalty ; meetings, assembled to question the first principles of Government, commence and separate with “ *nine times nine,*” having declared that “ they would make him the most “ glorious King that ever was in England ; ” which were words, says Hobbes¹, “ *that passed well enough for well meaning with the common people.*”²

But Revolutionists are wise in their generation ; and, like those caterers for anatomy lately executed, must intoxicate before they can destroy ; they exalt the King with their lips, and abase him by their actions, knowing full well that this sudden and overstrained devotion must terminate in apathy or distaste towards the object which excited it. The King “ has been preached up, but acted down ; “ and dealt with, as the Eagle in the fable did with “ the Oyster, carrying it up on high, that, by letting “ it fall, he might dash it in pieces.”³

¹ Behemoth.

² The unhappy monarch himself, in his reply to the Parliament’s declaration, says, “ but are all the specious promises, “ and loud professions, *of making us a great and glorious King ; “ of settling a greater revenue upon us than any of our ancestors “ have enjoyed ; of making us to be honoured at home, feared “ abroad ; resolved into this !*”

³ South’s Sermons : —

In Charles’s time they made war upon the King in his own name ; they are preparing it in this ; — we have subjoined extracts from two documents issued by the predominant powers in each period respectively, — the Parliament, and the Birmingham Union.

In a paper addressed to the King, in September, 1642, “ We “ (say the Parliament) have, for the just and necessary defence “ of the Protestant Religion, *of your Majesty’s person, crown, and*

So fearful is the revolutionary party in this kingdom lest the people should consider, and return to their contentedness, that every method is adopted to stifle reaction. Any expression of difference in town or country is met with insult, if not with violence; the Press resounds with abusive threats, as the Pulpits did aforetime with

“ *dignity*, of the laws and liberties of the Kingdom, and the privileges and power of Parliament, taken up arms; and appointed and authorized Robert Earl of Essex to be Captain-general of all the forces by us raised, and to lead and conduct the same against those Rebels and Traitors (the King’s friends!) and them to subdue and bring to condign punishment.”

In the Courier Newspaper of November 17. there is the Report of the Birmingham Political Union.”

“ In the performance of the task assigned them, your Committee has endeavoured to realize the wishes of the Council, by drawing out a plan for the organization of the Union, which will enable it to act as an efficient body of Police, in the maintenance of the laws, in the protection of person and property, *and in the support of our most gracious King, and his patriotic Ministers.*”

Now, as these “Committee-men” do not favour us with their whole intention at once, we must get at it by putting various points together.

Herald Paper of November 26. —

“ The Chairman of the National Political Union declared, *it was not* owing to the Reform Bill, or its rejection, that the Unions were necessary. They were necessary before the Reform Bill was agitated, *and they would be necessary after it should have passed!*”

Hudibras remarks,

“ For as we make war *for the King*
Against himself, the self-same thing
 Some will not stick to swear we do
 For *God*, and for *Religion* too.”

Part I. canto 2.

anathemas ; and the Unions renew their agitation, in the style of the parliamentary emissaries. “ Not
 “ only all petitions,” says Hume, “ which favoured
 “ the Church or Monarchy, from whatever hand
 “ they came, were discouraged, but the petitioners
 “ were sent for, imprisoned, and prosecuted as delin-
 “ quents ; and this unequal conduct was openly
 “ avowed and justified. Whoever desire a change, it
 “ was said, must express their sentiments ; for how,
 “ otherwise, shall they be known ? But those who
 “ favour the established Government in Church or
 “ State should not petition, because they already
 “ enjoy what they wish for.”¹ Lord Clarendon,
 writing of the period immediately preceding the out-
 break of the war, says, “ It cannot be denied but the
 “ people were every day visibly reformed in their
 “ understandings from the superstitious reverence
 “ they had paid the two Houses ; and grew sensible
 “ of their duty to the King, and of those invasions
 “ which were offered to his regal dignity.” Even
 May², the historian of the Long Parliament, and its
 secretary moreover, acknowledges that the two
 Houses “ had grown into great dislike with the
 “ people ;” and he assigns various reasons why its
 measures were no longer applauded. The same is
 taking place among ourselves : nor are the Revo-
 lutionists tardy to administer the same potions ;

¹ The petition from London, the petition from the county of Oxford (Clar. lib. iv.), and many others, for which the petitioners were most severely handled.

² Hist. Long. Parl. book i. cap. 9.

Popery¹, Privilege, and evil Counsellors, were the shouts of that day, — Pensions, Tithes, and Borough-mongers, are the shouts of this ; and, being uttered with vehemence, and sustained by intimidation, never fail to operate upon minds which, although subsiding into tranquillity, must be wondrously susceptible of fresh excitement.

In this country, at present, there are, exclusive of Tories, four sorts of politicians, — Theorists, Traitors, Moderates, and Time-servers.² Theorists are deaf to the voice of admonition, inasmuch as they draw wisdom (when they have it) from personal experience alone. Traitors, of course, we have nothing to do with ; as the evils we dread are the happiness they seek. Moderates, in all circumstances, are

¹ The charge of Popery was as much a pretence then as the “abuse of the Representation is now.” May, a pretty good authority, says, “that the Parliament, intending to charge “corrupt statesmen with injustice and tyranny, would put “Popery, or a suspicion of it, into the first place against them.”

² It must be in every man’s recollection how, on Reform, as well as other matters of importance, members of the Commons, valuing their seats more than their duty, have voted one way in the full hope that the House of Lords would vote the other. This conduct is generally unprincipled, and oftentimes dangerous. Such nice calculations were the death of Lord Strafford ; — read the following : —

“One gentleman came to a friend of his Lordship, asking “pardon for giving his affirmative vote for the Bill (Bill of “Attainder), saying, he did it against his opinion ; for he “thought him not guilty ; but he desired to preserve his credit “in the House, being confident that neither King nor Lords “would pass the Bill, and so his vote might do him no hurt.” — *Essay towards the Life of my Lord Strafforde, by Sir George Radcliffe.*

praiseworthy persons, if they be but intelligible ones. In the ordinary course of government and life, a moderate man is esteemed a pattern ; but in times such as these he is almost a nondescript. What is his composite nature of Anti and Bill-man ? Scarcely one knows his own mind, and no two can agree. But Time-servers are abundant, and may easily be discerned ; men who, with no evil intention, bring as heavy ruin upon a cause as the wickedest traitor.

It would seem that the two last-mentioned classes hope to be exempt from the ordinary operation of popular ascendancy ; by sacrificing their opinions to preserve their estates, and to mitigate violence by submitting to it in time. But “ the Moderate,” among our forefathers, had experience to the contrary ; for impatience of dissent is manifested no less by popular than monarchical rulers. A petition from Kent was prepared, “ with a desire that the Militia might not be otherwise exercised in that county *than the known law permitted* ; and that the Book of Common Prayer, *established by law*, might be observed.” The affair being noised about, a declaration was published, “ that none should presume to deliver that, or the like petition, to either House.” It was, however, brought to London ; and “ upon¹ the delivery thereof to the House of Commons (though the same was very modest, and in a more dutiful dialect than most petitions delivered to them), the bringers of the Petition were sharply reprehended ; two or three

¹ Clarendon, lib. v.

“ of them committed to several prisons ; the princ-
 “ pal gentlemen of the county, who had subscribed
 “ and advised it, sent for as delinquents ; charges,
 “ and articles of impeachment, drawn up against
 “ them ; and a declaration published, that whoever
 “ should henceforth advise or contrive the like Peti-
 “ tions should be proceeded against as enemies to
 “ the Commonwealth.”

The Petitioners from Somersetshire, equally respectful and equally moderate, met with similar treatment.

As the evil consequences of late measures began to unfold themselves, several persons were astounded at what they had done, and endeavoured (vainly, though honourably,) to repair the mischief. Lord Paget was one of them ; a nobleman “ who had
 “ contributed all his faculties to the Parliament’s
 “ service, and had been one of their teasers to broach
 “ those bold high overtures soberer men were not
 “ at first willing to be seen in.”¹ He repented him of his error, and thus beautifully notified it to the Parliament : —

“ June 11. 1642.

“ It may seem strange that I, who, with all zeal and earnest-
 “ ness, have prosecuted, in the beginning of this Parliament, the
 “ Reformation of all disorders in Church and Commonwealth,
 “ should now, in a time of such great distractions, desert the

¹ Clar. Hist. Reb.

In writing also the account of Mr. Pym’s death, Lord Clarendon says (book vii.), “ No man had more to answer for the
 “ miseries of the kingdom, or had his hand or head deeper in
 “ their contrivance. — *And yet, I believe, they grew much*
 “ *higher even in his life than he designed.*”

“ cause. Most true it is that my ends were the common good ;
 “ and whilst that was prosecuted, I was ready to lay down both
 “ my life and fortune : but when I found a preparation of arms
 “ against the King, under the shadow of Loyalty, I rather re-
 “ solved to obey a good conscience than particular ends ; and
 “ am now on my way to his Majesty, where I will throw myself
 “ down at his feet, and die a loyal subject. PAGET.” ¹

How singularly applicable to the present hour ;
 and how worthy the meditation of us all ! The
 sentiments will hereafter be entertained by many,
 and the conduct imitated by a few !

But many of those who persisted in their error
 could not have foreseen its entire consequences.
 Did the proud Earl of Warwick² anticipate his ser-
 vitude to levellers and upstarts ? Did the Earl of
 Pembroke expect to be degraded from his Peerage,
 to sit, by sufferance, in the House of Commons ?
 Why did Sir Edward Dering strike at the tallest
 Cedar³ of Lebanon ? — was it that he might earn
 confiscation and impeachment ? How was Denzil
 Hollis rewarded for his zeal ? — By accusation and
 exile. The Earl of Northumberland was slighted
 by the Parliament ; and Essex, its chief darling,
 threw up his commission : nor did republican fickle-

¹ Lords' Journals.

² The Earl of Warwick “ refused to sit (in the House of
 “ Commons) with Pride and Hewson, one of whom had been a
 “ *Drayman* and the other a *Cobbler*.” — *Noble's History of*
the House of Cromwell.

How despicable must this great Lord appear in the eyes of
 His Majesty's first Minister, whose secret councils are enlight-
 ened by intercourse with *Tailors* !

³ Archbishop Laud.

ness spare even the tomb of their aristocratic hero.¹

But others expiated more cruelly the errors of their conduct. Sir John Hotham had shut the gates of Hull against the King; and yet he was a person (says Clarendon) “of very good affections “to the Government, and no man *less desired to see* “*the nation involved* in a civil war than he:”—in less than two years afterwards, he expired on the parliamentary scaffold; and his son, too, underwent a similar fate. Lord Holland², the early champion of the Commons, survived their gratitude, and perished by their vengeance. Though many more instances might be cited, let these suffice to prove, that neither ought we to be deceived by the support of grandees to revolutionary principles; nor they, to cherish a hope that bygone merits will stand, for an hour, before democratic expediency.

Nor must the Bishops be allowed to flatter themselves that they will find security either in absolute

¹ “The Earl of Essex’s death happened on the 14th of Sept. 1646. On the 27th of November following, the Earl’s horse and effigies were cut to pieces and defaced in Westminster Abbey.” — *Whitlocke*.

² Upon the Lord Goring’s being reprieved, and the Earl of Holland not, Whitlocke observes, “This may be a caution against the affectation of popularity, when the Earl of Holland, who was as full of generosity to all sorts of persons, and readiness to help the oppressed, and to stand by the rights of the People, as any person of his quality in the nation, *was given up by the Representatives of the People*; and the Lord Goring, *who never made profession of being a friend to liberty, either civil or spiritual, was spared by the people.*”

tergiversation or moderate time-serving. They must vote according to their consciences, not their calculations; the Bill is no middling measure, but will either prop the church for a century, or almost instantaneously destroy it. But they *have* given their opinions on its nature; and a change of vote would now be attributable to fear, which conciliates no man. After King Charles had yielded to intimidation, he principally declined in public reverence; "because," says Lord Clarendon, "in such a case, he ought not to have confirmed the most politic or the most pious constitutions." Their episcopal predecessors, moreover, have bequeathed them a lesson: for they also were exposed to popular hatred, and received the same counsel, to place expediency before principle. They acquiesced in the advice, sacrificed their consciences, abandoned justice, and refused to vote against the attainder of Lord Strafford.¹ Did they, by this

¹ "Notwithstanding all this, the Bill had not that warm reception in the House of Peers that was expected; but, after the first reading, rested many days; and being then read the second time, depended long at the Committee: few men believing, upon consideration of the affections and parts of the several Lords, that of the fourscore who were present at the trial, above twenty would ever have consented to that act. Besides, it was not believed, now the formal trial and way of judicature was waved, the Bishops would so stupidly (to say no worse) exclude themselves from voting in a law which was to be an Act of Parliament." — *Clarendon*, lib. iii.

Again, "When, upon the trial of the Earl of Strafford, it was resolved to decline the judgment of the House of Peers, and to proceed by bill of attainder; and thereupon it was very unreasonably moved that the Bishops might have no vote in the

means, conciliate their enemies? In a few months the world saw them expelled from Parliament; and Episcopacy itself, in less than two years, was abolished by solemn resolution.¹

In the history of individuals and nations, dangers will occur in which the judgment wanders between the evils it must choose: reason, then, in need of a guide, must betake herself to conscience, which, although it cannot always avert calamity, seldom creates it.

Surely these things were written for our instruction; but for the instruction especially of those who, blessed by station and property, have leisure to contemplate the days that are past, and apply the results of study to the guidance of their inferiors. Should these warnings be disregarded, they will be responsible to Providence for their ingratitude, and to others for their neglect; for in the troubles to ensue, though all will suffer, a double

“ passing that Act of Parliament, because they pretended it was
 “ to have their hand in blood, which was against an old canon;
 “ this Bishop, without communicating with any of his brethren,
 “ very frankly declared his opinion, ‘ that they ought not to be
 “ ‘ present; and offered, not only in his own name, but for the
 “ ‘ rest of the Bishops,’ to withdraw always when that business
 “ was entered upon; and so *betrayed a fundamental right* of the
 “ whole order, to the great prejudice of the King, *to the taking*
 “ *away the life of that person, who could not otherwise have*
 “ *suffered.*” — *Clarendon*, lib. iv.

¹ September, 1642, in a Declaration of both Houses to their Brethren in Scotland. The final Ordinances passed in October, 1646.

portion of guilt will be imputed to ambitious Statesmen, in whose mouths the truth was partly concealed and partly corrupted.

We have humbly suggested these matters for consideration, because we believe there is yet time ; and, the eyes having been opened to the danger, the body will instinctively recoil from the gulf below. Yet if a new school of theorists be permitted to influence the judgment of mankind, and prove that history records the operations of fatalism, not the alternate successes of conflicting principles, then will our labour have been in vain. The knowledge of Mr. Macaulay is as little questionable as his talents : nevertheless, while hearing him deliver an oration upon passing events, one might believe that a devout and eloquent Mufti was expatiating on the truth and necessity of Predestination. Yet his position is overthrown by his argument ; for if the triumph of certain principles be forecast and inevitable, then would concession be fruitless as resistance : but we object to the doctrine, thinking it unsuited to the dignity of mankind, and the truth of Revelation. The history of Commonwealths is the aggregate history of individuals ; and the whole course of action, thought, and government demonstrates the conviction of a free agency.

If the course of events were ordained after that fashion, nations would rise and set like the sun in the Heavens,—splendid perhaps, but unprofitable to themselves,—our existences would be simply mechanical ; and man, instead of being an object

of hope and interest, would be rendered a mere spectacle for Providence and the creation.

But we fully admit the progressive improvement of mankind; it may be traced from the earliest periods to the age we live in; and, so far as our humble efforts might avail, we should rejoice to co-operate towards further amelioration. But the conservative party of this realm, reviled as the opponents of human happiness, consider the foundation before the superstructure; they know that the basis must be laid in religion: on that, all freedom, learning, and power may be safely intrusted to the meanest of our race, who would then, each in his calling, strive towards the advancement of true piety, and therein the exaltation of mankind.

The last matter to be touched upon will be best given in the descriptive and affecting language of the noble historian:—

“ According to the proclamation, upon the 25th
 “ of August, the standard was erected, about six
 “ of the clock in the evening of a very stormy and
 “ tempestuous day. The King, himself, with a
 “ small train, rode to the top of the Castle-hill,
 “ Varney the knight-marshal who was standard
 “ bearer, carrying the standard, which was then
 “ erected in that place, with little other ceremony
 “ than the sound of drums and trumpets: melan-
 “ choly men observed many ill presages about that
 “ time. There was not one regiment of foot yet
 “ brought thither; so that the trained bands, which
 “ the sheriff had drawn together, were all the

“ strength the King had for his person, and the
 “ guard of the standard. There appeared no con-
 “ flux of men in obedience to the proclamation;
 “ the arms and ammunition were not yet come
 “ from York, and a general sadness covered the
 “ whole town. The standard was blown down, the
 “ same night it had been set up, by a very strong
 “ and unruly wind, and could not be fixed again
 “ in a day or two, till the tempest was allayed.
 “ This was the melancholy state of the King’s
 “ affairs, when the standard was set up.”¹

To this, by the blessing of God, we have as yet no parallel.

¹ Clarendon, lib. v.

THE END.

LONDON:
Printed by A. & R. Spottiswoode,
New-Street-Square.



